

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 3, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-14 and 16-23 are rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1, 2, 12, and 19 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-14 and 16-23 remain pending in the application. The Examiner objects to claims 1 and 19.

In the Office Action, claims 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,677,741 to Yui (hereinafter “Yui”). Claims 1-10, 12-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui in view of US Patent No. 6,008,786 to Kimura et al. (hereinafter “Kimura”). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui in view Kimura, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,046,255 to D’Souza et al. (hereinafter “D’Souza”). Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui in view of D’Souza. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite.

With respect to the rejection of claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite, Applicants submit that the amendments to the claims further clarify the antecedent basis for the elements cited by the Examiner, and that the claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

The rejection of claims, 19, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated Yui is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 19, 21, and 22 each recites a method of driving a display device having a combination of features including, for example, “compensating the image information if it is determined the gray scale value is greater than the predetermined corresponding gray scale level, wherein compensating the image information includes compensating a gray scale value for the first color displayable by the display device and supplying a gray scale value for a second color displayable by the display device, and wherein the gray scale data for the second display color is retrieved using the gray scale value of the image received image information corresponding to

the first color displayable by the display device.” Applicants submit that Yui does not disclose at least this feature of the claims. The Examiner cites Yui as disclosing in step 6 of Fig. 2A supplying a gray scale value for a second color. Applicants submit that even if the Examiner’s conclusion regarding the disclosure of Yui is correct, Yui does not teach or suggest “supplying a gray scale value for a second color … wherein the gray scale data for the second display color is retrieved using the gray scale value of the image received image information corresponding to the first color displayable by the display device.” Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 19 is allowable over Yui.

Further, Applicants submit that Kimura, and D’Souza, analyzed singly or in any combination do not cure the above-identified deficiencies in the teachings of Yui, and that accordingly claims 19, 21, and 22 are each allowable over Yui, Kimura, and D’Souza.

The rejection of claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui in view of Kimura is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Yui and Kimura, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest the combined features of the claims.

Claims 1-10 each recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including, for example, “a lookup table to store a gray scale value corresponding to a predetermined gray scale level of a first displayable color; a data processing unit that retrieves a gray scale value from the lookup table using input data for the first displayable color, that determines from the retrieved gray scale value whether color reproducibility for the first displayable color is reduced, and that based on the determination compensates the input data for the first displayable color and supplies gray scale data for a second displayable color to produce compensated image information, wherein the gray scale data for the second display color is retrieved from the lookup table using the input data for the first displayable color.”

Applicants submit that Yui and Kimura, analyzed singly, or in any combination do not teach at least the above recited combination of features, and that accordingly, claims 1-10 are allowable over Yui and Kimura. For example, the Examiner relies on Yui to teach “supplies gray scale data for a second displayable color to produce compensated image information.” Applicants submit that even if the Examiner is correct regarding the disclosure of Yui, Yui does

not teach or suggest “wherein the gray scale data for the second display color is retrieved from the lookup table using the input data for the first displayable color.” Further, Kimura does not cure the deficiency in the teaching of Kimura. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-10 are allowable over Yui and Kimura for at least this reason.

Claims 12-14 and 16-18 each recites a method for improving a color reproducibility of a liquid crystal display (LCD) device having a combination of features including, for example, “compensating a received image information, the received image information including the detected gray scale value for a displayable color and retrieved gray scale values for at least one other color different from the displayable color to enhance the reproducibility of the displayable color, wherein the retrieved the gray scale values for the at least one other color are retrieved from a lookup table using a gray scale value for the displayable color of the received image information.”

Applicants submit that Yui and Kimura, analyzed singly, or in any combination do not teach at least the above recited combination of features, and that accordingly, claims 12-14 and 16-18 are allowable over Yui and Kimura. For example, Yui and Kimura do not teach or suggest at least “wherein the retrieved the gray scale values for the at least one other color are retrieved from a lookup table using a gray scale value for the first displayable color of the received image information.”

Claim 20 depends from claim 19 and includes by reference all of the limitations of claim 19. Applicants submit that claim 20 is allowable over the cited references including Yui, Kimura, and D’Souza, at least based on its dependency from claim 19 for the reasons given above for claim 19.

The rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui in view Kimura, and further in view of D’Souza et al is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1, and includes by reference, all of the elements of claim 1. As discussed above, Yui and Kimura do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1.

The Examiner cites D'Souza as teaching “mixing gray scale values of two colors” to allegedly cure deficiencies in the teachings of Yui and Kimura. Applicants do not reach the Examiner’s conclusion with regards to the teachings of D’Souza. Applicants submit that D’Souza does not cure the above described deficiencies in the teachings of Yui and Kimura with regards to claim 1 as discussed above. Applicants submit that Yui, Kimura, and D’Souza, analyzed singly or in any combination do not teach each and every element of claims 1, and that accordingly claim 1 and claim 11 depending from claim 1 are allowable over Yui, Kimura, and D’Souza.

The rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui in view of D’Souza is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 23 depends from claim 19 and includes by reference all of the elements of claim 19. As discussed above, Yui does not anticipate claim 19.

The Examiner cites D’Souza as teaching “mixing gray scale values of two colors” to allegedly cure deficiencies in the teachings of Yui. Applicants do not reach the Examiner’s conclusion with regards to the teachings of D’Souza. Applicants submit that D’Souza does not cure the above described deficiencies in the teachings of Yui and Kimura with regards to claim 19 as discussed above. Applicants submit that Yui and D’Souza, analyzed singly or in any combination, do not teach each and every element of claims 19, and that accordingly claim 19 and claim 23 depending from claim 19 are allowable over Yui and D’Souza.

With regards to the objections to claim 1 and 19, Applicants have amended the claims to spell “gray” consistently, and respectfully request that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendment and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 7, 2008

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No. 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants